

A 83.6  
F 655  
cap. 2.

## THE SCOPE OF THE POST-POSITIVE ARTICLE IN *OLAFS SAGA HINS HELGA*.

The post-positive definite article is undoubtedly the most striking distinguishing feature of the Scandinavian branch of the Germanic languages. Its source, as has long ago been pointed out, is the old adjectival definite article *enn* (fem. *en*, neut. *et*),<sup>1</sup> the coalition of the noun and the article as a suffixal element being made possible by the Old Scandinavian order of words, according to which the article and adjective quite generally followed the noun; e. g., *konongr enn góðe, fjall et stora*. The writing of *konongrenn* and *fjallet* was merely representing graphically that joining of noun and article, which already existed in the spoken language,<sup>2</sup> the two being easily combined because of the unstressed nature of the article, but especially because the initial sound of the latter was a vowel. In Icelandic the suffixed article came into general use in the twelfth century, although the written literature seems to show but four instances for that century, and only one single certain example as early as 1100.<sup>3</sup> Even for the thirteenth century only a dozen occurrences have been recorded<sup>2</sup>; consequently it can hardly have been fully established in the spoken language of Iceland before the last half of the twelfth century. For Old Norwegian, however, the date must have been considerably earlier, as clearly evidenced by its extent and its function in the literature of the first half of the thirteenth century. Old Norwegian was probably a good century in advance of Old Icelandic in the development of the post-positive article. Old Swedish, again, was rather conservative with respect to the new

<sup>1</sup> Or *inn*, *in*, *it* and *hinn*, *hin*, *hit*; see Noreen's *Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik*, 138,, 461-462.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the suffixed pronoun in modern speech: *han slo'n, jeg har'n ikke*.

<sup>3</sup> Finnur Jónsson, *Det norsk-islandske Skjaldesprog*, p. 80.

grammatical device, it would seem, although its limited presence in the older West Gothic law<sup>3</sup> is of but little value as a test of the condition in the language of the people at the time.<sup>4</sup>

---

In the following pages I shall try to show the extent to which the post-positive article has developed and to illustrate the circumstances of its use in an Old Norwegian monument from the middle of the thirteenth century. Departures from Old Icelandic and Old Swedish conditions will be noted only in significant cases.<sup>4</sup>

1. The general function of the suffixed article in *Olafs saga hins helga* will be indicated in the following passages of our text:<sup>5</sup>

*Son Harallz hins harfagra var Biorn kaupmaðr faðer Gud-roðar faður Harallz hins grænska faður Olafs hins hælga. Móðer Olafs hins hælga var Asta dotter Guðbranz kulu. Systir hæn-nar var Ulvilldr móðer hins hælga Hallvarðz oc Istrið móðer Stæigarþores. Haralldr hinn grænske var mikill hofðingi ivir riki sinu. I þann tíma reð firir Gautlande Sigríð en storraða. Ða bar sva at æinn sinni at Haralldr konongr kom or hærnaðe oc kæmr við Gautland. Sigríð gerir menn imot hanum oc byðr hanum til væizlu. Oc er buin var væizlan þa sæker hann til væizlunnar oc er drotningen en bliðazta við hann. (Chapter 1).*

*Nu la Knutr konongr við Lunduna bryggiur oc læitaðe ser raða at vinna borgena, oc la æigi laust firir. Hann tok þat rað at vita ef hann mætte koma anne Tæms a bryggiurnar oc i*

<sup>3</sup> See the selection in Noreen's *Altschwedisches Lesebuch*, pp. 1-8.

<sup>4</sup> In Danish the post-positive article was even later in its development.

<sup>4</sup> For Old Icelandic we have the excellent survey in Nygaard's *Norrön Syntax*, 1908, pp. 30-47; for late Old Swedish Ottelin's article on the "Codex Bureanus" in *Nordiska Studier tilegnade Adolf Noreen*, 1907, pp. 435-449. Cf. also Falk and Torp's *Dansk-Norskens Syntax*, 1900, pp. 61-73.

<sup>5</sup> The spelling of the original is retained except that where *v* appears for *u*, as in *nv*, I have written *u*, and *þ* is written *Ð*.

*borgena oc matte sva hvartvæggia unnit værða, . . . . .*  
*En hann kvaz æigi rað i sia at vinna ef konongr sæ æigi firir*  
*þui at þu konongr oc marger aðrer menn er her ero hava miklu*  
*mæira vitrlæik til mikilla raða en ek mindi hava, en þo man*  
*ec gera koste a at læita við með þinn afle oc læggia til nokcor*  
*rað. Hvat læggr þu a sagðe konongrenn. (Chapter 10.)*

*Guðbrandr er maðr næmðr er kallaðr var Dalaguðbrandr;*  
*hann var rikaztr manna i Dalunum i þann tima. Ðat er sact at*  
*Guðbrandr atte sun æinn. En þa er Guðbrandr fra þessor tið-*  
*ændi at Olafr konongr var komenn a Loar oc nauðgaðe menn til*  
*at hværva aftr til kristni þæirrar er þæir hafðu niðr kastat,*  
*þa er sact at Guðbrandr let skæra upp hæror oc staemdi allum*  
*Dælom til bæar þesser Hunzþorp hæitir a fund við sic. Oc þar*  
*komo þæir aller, oc var þar orgrynni liðs a stundu æini, firir*  
*þui at þar liggr vatn æitt nær þat er Logr hæitir, en byggðen*  
*mikil allum mægin at vatneno; matte þar bæðe fara a skipum*  
*oc a lande til þingsens. (Chapter 33.)*

2. Thus we find that already at this time the post-positive article is fully established as the symbol of particularization; it occurs in the above selections eleven times as an essential element of Old Norwegian syntax with a very definite semasiological content, namely, that of designating something as already having been presented to consciousness by a previous mention or suggestion, or it is for other reasons regarded as present in the situation. In the former case the article, therefore, is equivalent to "the said," "just mentioned," "spoken of already," while in the latter case it will most commonly be reducible to a possessive pronoun, a demonstrative, or some adverbial phrase. The latter will be illustrated below. In our first selection the article individualizes an object or person because previously mentioned in the case of *væizlan* and *drotningen*; these are both present in the consciousness of the reader because the queen has already been spoken of as inviting the king to a feast. In the second selection there is a similar case in *bryggiurnar* and in the third one in *vatneno*, both of which definite forms follow previous mentions. And further in the

case of *borgena*, the antecedent of which is the name of the city, *Lundun*, already named in line one. In the compound epithet *Dalaguðbrandr* the first element of the compound introduces the idea of the valley district where Guðbrandr lived. The idea 'valley' is therefore already present in the situation, and so indicated by the definite form *Dalunum* in the next mention.

Slightly more complex is the case in *þingsens*. Here the word *þing* has not been used, nor has a synonym of it, but the idea of an assembly has nevertheless been completely drawn into the consciousness of the reader by the sentence, *Guðbrandr. . . . . stæmdi allum Dælom a fund við sic*. In further illustration I shall cite the following passage from Chapter 7, 1-4: *Oc æitt sinni ber sva at drotnengen lykr upp kistu sina, en svæinnenn Olafr var hia staddr, ser hvar upp kæmr nokcot biart oc fagrt. Hon vill hann æigi sia lata. Hann fær til oc gripr um sværzhiolltena, hann brigr sværðinu oc lysir halega. Hann spyr hværr þat æigi. Hon sægir at þat sværð bar Haralldr faðer hans*. Here the antecedent of *sværzhiolltena* is the indefinite *nokcot biart oc fagrt*. In so far as the latter contains no mention of an object, and is in itself capable of suggesting a number of things to us, we should expect perhaps some mention of the fact that the 'bright' object proved to be a sword before 'sword' can be regarded as already individualized and so designated in the definite form in a subsequent mention as in *sværzhiolltena*. However, the use of the latter form in this first mention of the sword is prompted by the vivid suggestion of a sword which is already contained in the words *nokcot biart oc fagrt* in this particular context, that is after the characterization of Olaf of the preceding chapter, which has shown him to be a remarkable child and most promising material for kingship and the royal pursuit of warfare and conquest.

3. The selections that have been cited, however, indicate certain departures from the practice in present day speech. So in Chapter 10 *konongr* appears in the indefinite form once, and once in the definite, both being cases which today would require the definite article. Also the modern dialectal descendant



of *riki sinu* would put *riki* in the definite form when the possessive follows (*riget sit*). Other examples will appear in the following passages:<sup>6</sup> (*Sigrið*) *stæmnir nu þing við folcet, sægir at þeir villdu girndast a rikit oc sægir at hon villdi ægi at folket læge undir þeirra alagum. Nu kæmr hon ser sva i traust við lanzfolc.* (Ch. 5); *Oc sialfr hellt hann* (*Olafr Trygvason*) *namna sína undir skirn.*<sup>7</sup> (Ch. 6); \* \* \* *hængia hann nu upp saclausan firir log fram.*<sup>8</sup> (Ch. 111). *Hvat er nu Æinar, eða brast boge þinn?* *Æinar svarar: ægi brast boge, hælldr allr Noregr or hændi þer.* (Ch. 27); *Ec stændr a kniom oc liggia uti iðren* (Ch. 95); *Siðan foro sændimenn aftr oc sagðo Olave orð iarlens* (Ch. 26).

4. While therefore the article has developed to a point where it is an indispensable syntactical device, it is yet clearly in a developing state; its use has not spread to a considerable number of instances where it came to be fixed in the later growth of the language. On the other hand, its absence is in a large number of cases in harmony with modern practice, while in certain instances where the definite article occurs, the modern language does not exhibit it. As will become clear from the following discussion, much that is old appears along with that which is new in the use of the definite article in our text. There is a progressive tendency, but there is also evidence of a conservative practice and the influence of the fixed forms of an earlier time, which prevents the employment of the external mark of definiteness even where individualization exists. That is, in a very large number of instances the person or object mentioned is already present in the consciousness of the speaker or writer and included in the particular situation of the narrative and therefore definitely individualized, and yet is left indefinite in form.

The choice of the defining modifier is of course governed

<sup>6</sup> The references are to chapters in Unger's edition, Christiania, 1849.

<sup>7</sup> Modern Norwegian *under daaben*.

<sup>8</sup> Modern *saglös for loven*, 'innocent before the law.'

by the degree of individualization desired. Therefore the investigation of the use of the post-positive article becomes a part of the larger problem of the semasiology of the demonstrative pronoun, the two definite articles, and the indefinite article.<sup>9</sup> The demonstrative pronoun represents the highest degree of individualization, while the pre-positive definite article expresses a more emphatic particularization than does the post-positive article; finally, the use of the indefinite article or some indefinite pronoun leaves the object or person named more completely in the domain of the undefined than the simple noun would. However, because the post-positive definite article seems to fill a particular function, a function which in the linguistic consciousness of the time is rapidly coming to be set aside for it to perform, it becomes possible to investigate apart from the remaining defining qualifiers the conditions which governed the use of this article at the time.

#### A. LIMITATIONS IN THE USE OF THE POST-POSITIVE ARTICLE.

A consistent use of the article would require complete harmony between content and form,—always to employ the required defining modifier where psychological definiteness exists. Such harmony, however, nowhere exists here any more than elsewhere in the domain of language. However strong the tendencies of a language to logical correctness be, a healthy growing language which portrays the conflicting tendencies of living speech will always exhibit in larger or smaller measure formal grammatical elements, words, groups of words or phrases, in which the thought content seems to fail of complete expression. Such phrases and word-groups become fixed, petrified in a particular order and form, which is thereby made to serve new uses and to change its meaning-content.<sup>10</sup> The single word, on the other hand, may more easily adapt itself to the growing tendencies of the language.

<sup>9</sup> And indeed also that of the total absence of article.

<sup>10</sup> There is of course, therefore, always complete expression of thought after such phrases and groups have become definitely fixed with the new meaning content.

5. The post-positive article is not used in cases where the person or object named is unique and therefore always definite anyway. These are, of course, principally proper names of persons and locality. Names of persons are regularly used without a defining modifier, although the modern dialects of all parts of Norway suffix the article to surnames to indicate familiarity. With the same function the third personal pronoun is put before the given name in dialectal speech, and this is a feature that was fully developed in Old Norwegian in the plural and in the singular both (see below § 32). The Olafs saga offers two occurrences, both in the same sentence, in Ch. 49: *oc i því kæmr hann Osbiorn i stovona snarazk þegar at hanum Þore en hann stoð rett fyrir konongenom*. The pronoun in these two cases serve very nearly the same function as the article in *konongenom*.

6. Names of localities, geographical divisions, or clan districts are used without the article. Some examples occurring with one reference for each are: *Væstfold*, 2, *Gautland*, 2, *Sviðþioð*, 4, *Suðrvic*, 9, *Norvasund*, 16, *Læira*, 16, *Haðaland*, 39, *Ringariki*, 39, *Hæiðmork*, 39, *Hjaltland*, 48, *Jaðar*, 51; *Gaulardal*, 59, *Finmork*, 69; and in plural forms: *Soleyjar*, 39, *af Orknæyum*, 48, (*Guðbrandr af*) *Dalum*, 6, *i Garðum austr*, 46, *i Austrvegum*, 12, *a Norðrlandum*, 43, *Jorsalir*, 70, *Silvellir*, 24, or *Fjarðum* 36. The name *Viken* forms a notable exception in that the definite form is here as common as the indefinite, occurring in 2 (twice), 26 (twice), 31, 66; the indefinite *Vik* appears five times (8, 23, 69, and 109).<sup>11</sup> *Dalir* (*Guðbrandsdalir*) has the definite form in *Dalunum* (Ch. 33), which has already been discussed above. The definite form which occurs three times more in the remainder of the narrative concerning "Dale-Gudbrand" is in part due to the character of the name, which seems not yet to have become crystalized as a proper name; and of course as long as that was the case,

<sup>11</sup> In modern speech, the practice leans toward the definite form, e. g.: *Telemarken*, *Hedemarken*, *Sætersdalen*, *Jæderen*, *Gudbrandsdalen*, *Østerdalen*, *Finmarken*; *Östlandet*, but *Numedal*, *Hallingdal*; *Hadeland*, *Solør*, *Nordland*.

the use of *dalir* for the particular valley region under discussion would necessitate the use of the definite form to show that individualization is actually present.

7. Names of ethnic groups, peoples and nationalities always appear in the indefinite form. Examples: *Atto orrostu hafðe Olafr við Kantaraborg*; *barðezt við Dane oc Vindi*, 12; *Olafr var æigi i sac læysi við Syia*, 15; *þat havum ver oc spurt at Uplændingar hafa kastat niðr kristni sinni*, 73; *Nu frago Raumar at Olafr konongr biozc upp þangat*, 39; \* \* \* *oc gera nokcot ilyct þvi Gyðingar gerðo við drotten varn*, 50; *þar la Olafr þann vætr með liði sinu oc toko Syiar hann æigi handum sem þeir ætlaðu*, 15; (Olafr) *spyr nu at Ðrænder ero i svicræðum við hann*, 71.<sup>12</sup> No instances occur of the definite form.<sup>13</sup>

8. Common nouns representing unique objects or abstract ideas, though definite in function, are written in the indefinite form. Here belongs first of all the word *guð*, 'the christian god'; other words of this class are: words for paradise, hell, the world, earth, the sun, et al. Examples: \* \* \* *þæim er guð styrkir*, 16; *ef þer vilið mitt rað hava þa hæitum nu aller a almatkan guð*, 17; *nu stæig sva Olafr konongr or þesso riki oc i himinrikis dyrð*, 93; *sal þin man fyrr vera i hælvti en bloð þitt se kallt a iarðunni*, 90; *en sa stigr standa til himna*, 89; *oc ognir ero miklir oc æigi nar sol at skina*, 91; *oc trua nu a æinn guð þann er skop himin oc iorð*, 35; *oc tækr nu sol upp at koma*, 67.

9. While these examples illustrate the usual practice, there are a number of exceptions; especially do the words *verold*, *sol*, and *hæimr* often appear in the definite form; e. g., *æftir þvi sem þa var er sialfr skaparenn for af veroldenne*, 93; *þa litu menn til solarennar*, 38; *þa varð sva mikil ogn at solen fal gæisla sinn oc gerðe myrct*, 93; *allr hæimrenn var mer nu firir augum*, 81; *Skapare* (see example cited above) and *andskota*

<sup>12</sup> In: *Nu kæmr mote konongenom boanda hærrenn Ðrænder oc Halæygir, Naumdæler oc Mærer*, 89, the clan names are indefinite and would be so written in the language today.

<sup>13</sup> Others occurring: *Egðir*, *Finnar*, *Gautar*, *Girkir*, *Hjaltlendingar*, *Irar*, *Nor<sup>x</sup>menn*, *Skanungar*, *Sviar*, *Verdælar*, *Væringiar*.



both have the definite form (*er hann fenge fastlegra bundit sic i andskotans villu oc farunæyti*, 122), while *fiandi* is always so written; e. g., *sva aumlega hafðe fiandenn hann blindaðan at*, etc., 122, and further in 122: *hann gafsc i fiandans valldi, siðan fylgði hann fianndans raðom*.<sup>13</sup> There is clearly a growing tendency to individualize the universe and large parts of it, as *haf*, *sær* (*sior*), *land*, *fiall*, *tungl*, *sky*, *lopt*, etc., e. g.; *en et skip Olafs varo buin þa hellt hann tvæim knarrum væstan af Ænglande oc fengo mickit veðr i haveno oc sio storan*.<sup>14</sup>

10. In the same general category belong names of holydays and festal periods, as also the names of the days of the week. These appear about in equal proportion with indefinite and definite forms. Examples of the former: *hann fær norðan annat sinni um fastu með ii skip*, 49; *frettr um at Olafr konongr skal taka væizlu i æyna i paskaviku*, 49; *en paskadag geck hann til tals við konongenn*, 56; *þetta var firir iol Tomasmessodag er hann*, etc., 69; *hann hafðe fastat ix drotensdaga, en matazk iamnan fastudaga*, 83; *en at iolom skilldi boande hværr fa, etc.*, 77; *gaðe æigi at drottensdagr var*, 110; *en þat var a miðvikudægi*, 93. With the article: *um paskavikuna*, 26; *fastudagrenn*, *fastudagenn*, 50, *paskahælgina*, 50, *messodagenn*, 123, *a drotensdaginum*, 110, *drottensdagenn*, 50, *þvattdagenn*, 51, *miðvikudagenn* 83. See also B. 35.

11. So far we have noted only the condition for the nominative, dative and accusative cases. A noun in the genitive is ordinarily employed in the indefinite form; the genitive being itself a defining modifier, its presence continued for a long time to exclude the definite article. The material may be considered under three heads, as follows: (1) the genitive that precedes the independent noun; (2) the genitive that follows the independent noun; (3) the genitive and following noun

<sup>13</sup> See below, 24.

<sup>14</sup> In: *oc þegar er fæsti skipet þa gecc upp aftr en framme stæyp-tizt sva at sior fell inn um soxen*, 21, *sior* is not definite, does not stand for 'the sea,' but means 'a quantity of water,' while in: *um haustet er hann for væstan þa tyndizk i Ænglanz have*, 77, *have* is quite unstressed, *Ænglanz have* being an inchoate compound.

are in the nature of a compound. In the last case the genitive is, as we should expect, always indefinite, a usage which accords with that of the modern Scandinavian languages also. Examples: *konongsnamn*, 6, *lænnzmannznamn*, 6, *konongs bunaðe*, 14, *boanda söner*, 24, *Angulseyar sund*, 28, *hæraðs konongar*, 35, *Dana hofðingiar*, 35, *konongs hirð*, 43, *i Ænglands have*, 77, *konongs havuð*, 26, *Sauðungs sund*, 21, *konongs sund*, 16, *lauzlagum*, 40; *lannzmenn*, 18, *agiætesmann*, 55; and (*hvert*) *manz barn*, 28. As these examples indicate the second noun is also regularly indefinite in form, to which rule there are, however, the following exceptions: *lanzhærrenn*, 58, *boanda-hærrenn*, 89, *Syia hærrenn*, 66, *boanda liðinn*, 41 and 70, *boanda sunen*, 82, *æinseto mannzens*, 19; and *konongs homnenne*, 58.<sup>15</sup> In some of these cases the definite form is perhaps prompted by the desire for vivid narrative.

Where the two nouns do not actually form a compound, we should expect an increasing use of the definite form; yet here also the indefinite is normal; e. g., *nu var iarlenn upp læiddr a konongs skip*,<sup>16</sup> 22; *en iarlenn var af have dregenn at konongs raðe*, 21; *þa for Þorkiæll at hæmna broðor sins er raðet hafðe fyrir þingmanna liði*, 9. Definite form of the second noun occurs in *drotens svikaran*, 70, (twice). The definite genitive appears in the following cases: *a konongsens valld*, 91; *i konongsens bloðe*, 95; *konongsens vilia*, 49.<sup>17</sup>

If the genitive follows it is regularly definite, while the governing noun is always indefinite. Examples: *Nu var mikill gnyr boandanna*, 38; *scip jarlsens*, 27; *oc brann lutr boandanna við oc rukcu bænnr undan*, 39; *oc þa hæyrðu þeir gnyenn af liði boandanna*, 89; *nu ser konongr lið boandanna*, 89; *oc kæmr við æy þa er Þorer sel, armaðr konongsens reð firir*, 49; *en þat var vænia konongsens*, 50; *nu dvælsk dauði mannzens*, 50; *en fíorar dyrr varo a husi æinseto mannzens*, 19;

<sup>15</sup> It is possible that some of these cases are not compounds, but merely juxtaposition of genitive and noun; see (1) above.

<sup>16</sup> This may be regarded as a compound perhaps.

<sup>17</sup> Differing therefore from late Old Swedish. See *Nordiska Studier*, p. 437.

*eftir þessa spa einseto mannzens for Olafur braut*, etc., 19; *kraptr guðanna*, 41. There is no occurrence of the indefinite form of the genitive nor of definite form of the independent noun.<sup>18</sup>

12. Our discussion has now brought us to the possessive pronoun group. It was observed above that the genitive case, being itself defining in function, usually excluded the post-positive article. The combination of noun and possessive pronoun is absolute, the possessive and the definite article being in our text mutually exclusive. The reason is of course that the possessive pronoun is itself both particularizing and possessive in function, which therefore precluded the need of labeling the noun with the suffixal symbol of particularization. And the practice is equally consistent when the possessive follows the noun as when it precedes.<sup>19</sup> Examples of the former: *mæð liði sinu*, 13; *lið yðat*, 13; *kistu sina*, 7; *lið hans*, 8; *sunr hænnar*, 15; *Olafur hælldr skipum sinum*, 21; *tok til boga sins*, 27; *kænni ek sunu mína*, 91.

13. It is well-known that in Old Norse as in Old East Scandinavian there was no fixed order in the possessive groups, the possessive, as the genitive noun, might either precede or follow the independent noun, contrary therefore to the practice in the modern Norwegian dialects, where the possessive pronoun regularly follows. An enumeration of the occurrences of the two orders with several possessives in the first sixty pages of the Olafs saga discloses some difference in the relative frequency of the two orders for the different possessives, as will be seen in the following table. The per cent. is for the post-position of the pronoun:

<sup>18</sup> The condition in late Old Swedish, as represented in the *Codex Bureanus*, seems to be the opposite, in that here the noun that precedes a genitive is put in the definite form, as *skiänkaren konongs*. See *Nordiska Studier*, 437-438.

<sup>19</sup> In the modern language the noun remains indefinite if preceded by the possessive, but becomes definite if it itself precedes the possessive: *sin haand*, but *haanden sin*.

	<i>Sin</i>	<i>þeirra</i>	<i>min</i>	<i>hænnar</i>	<i>var</i>	<i>hans</i>	<i>yðar</i>	<i>þin</i>
Number	184	22	21	8	24	104	27	33
	82%	73%	71%	63%	62%	58%	55%	50%

Thus the position of *sin* is post-positive in eighty-two per cent of the total occurrences, while the preponderance is also very considerable in the case of *þeirra*, *min* and *var*.<sup>1</sup> Similarly striking is the fact that in the possessive pronouns of the second person the ratio is about the same for the two positions. The reason for the general suffixal position of *sin* lies, no doubt, in its wholly unstressed nature, a consideration which will also account for the preponderance of *min* in this position, both being very frequently replaceable by the post-positive article. For example in: *þa er Olafr svænske var ifra fallen þa tok Onundr Sviðþioð oc allt hans riki æftir faður sin*; here *faður sin* might with equal clearness and correctness be changed to *faðurinn*, while *hans* (the dead kings) retains a little more stress (as it regularly does), not being reflexive but referring to some one else. The unstressed nature of the reflexive possessive *sin*, then, led to its use after the noun and its great preponderance over other possessives brought about post-position of the possessive as the regular order in the later progress of the language.

14. Passing now to the combination of demonstrative pronoun and noun, we find, as we should expect, that only in the rarest exceptions does the definite form of the noun occur in conjunction with a demonstrative. The demonstrative is functionally the symbol of emphatic individualization, hence further individualization of the noun by means of the weaker post-positive article is in itself superfluous. The expansion of the post-positive article also to those nouns which already have a pre-positive article is a rather striking and unusual feature which modern Norwegian and Swedish have in common, but sporadic instances of it are to be found as far back as the fourteenth century, occurring here and there also in our text. Examples of the regular use: *þann vætr, i þvisa lande, þænna sama vætr, i þesse for, lannz þessa, þenna kost, a þæssom dægi, i þann*

<sup>1</sup> So also with *hænnar* but the occurrences here are limited.



*tíma, sa maðr, a þema bæ, þann dag*, etc. Therefore also then, the noun which is followed by a relative (that is the demonstrative in relative function) is also regularly written in the indefinite form, e. g., *Olafr sætti log þau er hæita Sefslog*, 32; *oc stæmði allum Dælom til bæar þess er Hunzþorp hæitir*, 33; *ver havum horvet aftr til siðar þess er varer forælldrar hava haft*, 33; . . . *þat var mer þa i hug er hann brændi knor þann firir mer er bæztr mindi vera*, etc., 91; *læggr þar til goðar æignir af iarðum þeim sem hann atte*, 38.

In the following cases demonstrative and definite nouns are associated: *þa syndizt hanum sa maðrenn er hanum bar i draumenn*, 4; . . . . . *oc lat hann ægi sia gripina þessa*,<sup>20</sup> and preceding a relative in: *sægir hann mikinn agiætesmann oc olican aðrum mannum, oc hvesso mikit er skil þann siðenn er hann hævir eða konongr*, 55; *oc tok hændi sinni i munn hanum oc togaðe til sin þann litla stubben er æftir var tungunnar*, 107; *oc þa sa þeir at tungan bloðraðe, þa reðo þæil til þess stuðsens er æftir var oc drogo til sin*, etc., 109; *oc sva synezt mer sem minna se nu karp þitt eða hyrningsens þess er þer kalleð biscop yðat*, 37.

15. The indefinite pronouns *sumr* and *allr* are used with the indefinite form of the noun when the objects are named in a general statement, and not conceived of as present or otherwise individualized, as: *sva er sact fra Knuti kononge at hann sætte tíðir hatiðardaga alla til kirkiu þeirrar er biscop song tíðir at*,<sup>21</sup> 11; or even where definite if followed by a relative clause, see § 16, as. . . *oc toko alla vikingaseto þa er þar varo*, 12. In: *en nu for sva at þeir Olafr hafðu klæðe þeirra oc allt fe, en þeir varo drepner oc hafðe Olav sigr*, 12, *allt fe*, though present in the situation, has the indefinite form because qualified by a possessive pronoun (*klæðe þeirra oc allt fe*=*klæðe oc allt fe þeirra*). See § 12. For discussion of the use of these and other pronouns with definite noun, see below B. 30-32.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. the dual article in: *hinir hærtæknu mennener varo i tjall-dunum*, 53; *hinn fyrra dagenn*, 37; *hinn fyrra fastudagenn*, 50; *þatt land hitt sama*, 68.

<sup>21</sup> In such a case a *þa litu aller bændr til solarennar* the principle discussed in §26 below is also to be noted.

16. Coordinated nouns regularly have the indefinite form. Examples: . . . . . *fyllizt skipet oc þa næst hvælfði, en iarlenn var af kave dregenn, af konongs raðe oc aller hans menn, þæir sem nast var, en sumir letoze bæðe firir griote oc scotom* (lost their lives before the stones and shots), 21; *hvat er þat kvað iarl, þat quað Olafr at yðat riki hævir mikít veret i lande þesso, en heðan ifra man þæt ækci værða oc munu konongar þæir er til ero borner giæta lanz oc rikis oc sinnar sæmdor sem vera a,* 22; *gersc mikil briostaðr sem kononge somer oc hans tign hæver, hygg af harme, glæðsk af þægnom en þægnar af yðr,* 46; *siðan foro þæir oc komo a fund konongs oc baro upp sin ærende, oc sagðu at bændr villdu æiga þing við hann oc sætia grið þæirra amillum konongs oc boanda,* 35; *oc (þæir) trua nu a æinn guð þann er skop himin oc iorð,* 35.<sup>22</sup> *Oc var Olafr en digri með þriu skip æin þar amillum læiðangrs oc landhærs,* 15. *Olafr spyrr hann hvart hann mindi værða konongr at Norege oc oðrlazt land oc riki oc þa sæmd sem minir frændr hafðu,* 19.

17. A noun modified by an adjective stands without the article, the weak inflexion of the adjective marking the definiteness that is present. Examples: *hallda retta tru eða þola dauða,* 32; *miskunn guðs almategs,* 123; *ef þer vilið mitt rað hava þa hæitum nu aller a almatkan guð,* 17; *nu fara þæir austan um æystra riki,* 80, *helldo siðan retta tru;* 38.<sup>1</sup>

18. Fixed phrases and word-groups in which the noun is psychologically definite remain inflexionally indefinite because here the noun forms a syntactical unit with the governing preposition or verb with which it occurs. There is evidenced in these constructions a struggle between two opposing principles. The noun, indefinite formally and originally probably usually was so in the particular group, has come to have definite meaning. That the idea is definite can, however, be clear only in cases where the noun in the particular group now always has definite

<sup>22</sup> This may also be accounted for according to §§ 8, and the preceding two examples according to §§ 25-26.

<sup>1</sup> However these cases are all subject to the rule discussed in §§ 8 and 24.

meaning, otherwise the context alone gives the key. In cases therefore where the word group may still and often is general in signification, a progressive tendency sometimes finds illustration in that the noun is made definite, especially where emphasis is intended, as for the purpose of giving greater vividness to the narrative. Most numerous are phrasal combinations of preposition and noun to express locality, destination, time, manner, or the means of an act. The phrase is adverbial in function and survives in a great many petrified phrases today.<sup>23</sup>

In treating these phrases it is necessary to guard against confusing those that are actually indefinite with those that are not. In the following passage for example *scog* is of course indefinite: *En af lande ofan kom Olafur hinn Svænse með sva mikinn hærr at sva var at sia um allar strander a landet upp sem i scog sæ.*<sup>24</sup> The material may be grouped under two heads: (1) phrases of locality and destination, etc.; (2) temporal phrases; (3) miscellaneous phrases. The prepositions most commonly used are *a*, *i*, *or*, *at* and *tíl*. Examples:

(1) Phrases of locality and destination:

*Ðar hafðe Olafur hinn svænse sialfr fylking sína firir a lande,* 15; *skip þeirra stóðo i læiru en ovigr hærr alla vega a lande upp ifra,* 17; *hverr maðr er a haf rere skilldi gera kononge landvarðu hvaðan sem hann rere,* 77; *oc rann þa sol upp a fjall,* 38; *þar i naand,* 120; *þar i lande,* 56; *nu geresc Haralldr grænse or lande,* 5; *en ii c manna hafðe hanum austan or lande fylct,* 86; *en þat undrumk ek at þu agnar oss guði yðru, þat er bæðe er blint oc dauft oc ma hvarke biarga ser ne aðrum oc kæmsk all-drigi or stað,* 38; *moðr hverr er af lande fære skilldi giællða landaura,* 77; *en þat sægia menn æftir anlat Svæins tiuguskægs, at Olafur Harallzson hafðe komet Aðalrað kononge eptr i land*

<sup>23</sup> For a representative list see my edition of Björnson's *Synnöve Solbakken*, note 6, page 8 and note 3, page 20; or Falk and Torp cit. pp. 41-42. Seidel's *Phraseologie der Englischen Sprache*, 1905, offers considerable material for English and German.

<sup>24</sup> 'But Olaf the Swede came down to the sea with such a large army that all along the coast of the country northward it was as if one were looking at a forest.'

með miklum raðom...., 9; en i þann tíma kæmr Olaf Trygvason i land oc boðar þegar truna, 6; þa man ek fara með ykr at sinni oc með ængu of ræfli ef þit ero þa lausir er konongr ser mik,...þeir raðazc nu til færðar, 55;...oc sætti hann iarl innar hárðar með ser, 22; nu for Svæinn iarl suðr með lande, 26; oc sigldi Olaf Harallzson þar þrim skipum igiægunum neset oc ut til hafs með mikilli frægðarfærð, 16. Olaf konongr for austan at fiarum til hafsens, 80; en þeir sagðu at hann var ægi æinn at þæim, hælldr var þar mikil foldi riddara i for með hanum, 13.

(2) Temporal phrases: The phrases occurring are *i dag*, *i nott*, *i* (or *a*) *morgon*, *i sumar*, *i vætr*, *i fystu*, *a manaðe* (in or during the month), *at kveldi*, *um rið*, *at sinni*, *i senn*, *silla dax* (15, late in the day), *of sið dax*, 19,—*þriðia sinni*.<sup>25</sup> Most of these phrases survive in the same form in the modern language; e. g., *inat* 'to-night,' *idag* 'today,' *i morgen* 'tomorrow,' *i sommer* 'this summer,' *i vinter* 'this winter,' *i fysto* (literary language *i förstningen*) 'in the beginning,' *om kvelden* 'during the evening,' *i senn* 'at the time' (cf. Dan. *ad gangen*). Further also *at undurni* and *at dagurðarmale* in, e. g., *Olaf konongr var nu komenn til haugs nokcors um morgonenn at undurni*, 87; *en Olaf hafðe mæssu aðr oc allt lið hans oc allar tíðir oc aller mættir at dagurðarmale aðr en þeir færre til bor-dagans*, 26. The preposition *um* almost without exception governs a definite noun (see below 34), but there would seem to be an exception in:.....*en sva lauk at flester aller toko við kristni*<sup>26</sup> *oc fengo kononge sunu sina oc heto þui at þeir skilldu allðrigin oftarganga af kristni. Sæner þæirra varo væl halldner við konongenom oc gerðozc væl siðaðer. Ðat er sact at kononge var þar um nott sem Bæar hævita*, 74. We must, however, recognize in all these phrases the factor of relative definiteness as indicated in the context. *Um* (Fritzner *um*, 11) is regularly

<sup>25</sup> Indefinite are: *um siðir*, (after a time), *um rið*, (for or after a while), *um stund*, (after a while). *Um siðir*=modern *omsider*; *um stund*=*om en stund*.

<sup>26</sup> The discussion is about Olafs visit at Lesje.



followed by the definite because the time indicated is specific, the meaning being 'during,' *um nottena* meaning that night, during the night.<sup>27</sup> So in the immediately preceding part of this same account we are told: *þa for Olafr konongr oc kom fram i æinbua oc var þar um nottena oc um morgonen a Læsiar* (=and stopped there that night and the next morning he was at Lesje). But *um nott* in the later passage Ch. 74 is rather to be translated 'over night' in which the noun is less definite, *vera um nott* (stop over night) approaching more a formal word-group.<sup>28</sup> In Chapter 73: *oc ma þar ængi maðr væra um nætr* (stay there by night) *firir trollagange*, *nætr* is quite indefinite.

(3). Other phrases of this kind are: *i fylgd með, i liking* (*æftir Þor*, 36), *a sundi, a hægri hand, a aðra hond, i fange* (*Þormoðr mæter kono æinni oc hafðe við i fange*, 97), *i atgangu* ('in the attack,' 92), *i kaf* ('in the deep,' 21), *af kafe*, *i for* (*i for varo með Svæini hinir mesto hofðingiar i landeno*, 26)<sup>29</sup> *a læið, af livi, a vegom, a fotom, við iarðu* (*þa lagðe hann við iarðu konongenn*, 104)<sup>30</sup>; *i jorð*, and finally *a braut*, which, however, is already a pure adverb, and hence often written in one word: *ibrotti, abraut, braut, brot* (modern *bort*).

19. The feeling that these phrases are, however, no longer fully adequate to express that degree of individualization which the context sometimes required led to the employment of defining adverbs, as in the following: *þar við land*, 17, 18; *hæim i land*, 54; *a land upp ifra*, 17; *þar a land*, 20; *þar var i for með*, etc., 20; *maðr kom af lande ovan þar sem*, etc., 20; *her i land*, 90. Finally, under the influence of the progressive tendency, the fixed word group is broken up entirely and the noun

<sup>27</sup> *um*, in the meaning 'for' or 'after' is, however, followed by the indefinite noun because of the indefiniteness inherent in the noun.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. also: *Skjalgr kom a Jaðar um nott* (by night) and *um vætr*, ch.

<sup>29</sup> *I for* is indefinite in: . . . . . *oc sagðe at Olafr, var i for væstan til Ænglanz a skipum*, 17.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *þegar iamskiot er hann lyptizt af iarðunni þa*, etc., 111.

is given the definite form that its function in the particular case requires, as: *Síðan let hann vera strængi i kaveno milla skipanna oc la þar síðan með tialldaðum skipum i sundinu*, 21. *Logr hæitir en bygden mikil allum mægin at vatneno; matte þar bæðe fara a skipum oc a lande til þingsens. Oc nu er þeir komo til þings þa stændr Guðbrandr upp*, etc., 33; *oc ma þar ængi maðr vera um nætr firir trollagange oc mæinvetto er þar ero a sætreno*, 73; *sigldu suðr firir Fjarðune*, 20; *Olafr konongr for austan at fjarum til hafsens*, 80; \* \* \* *ef þeir reðe Olaf konong or landeno*, 68.

20. Such supplementary specification is prompted by the desire to express that particularization which psychologically is present, but which the phrase does not formally contain. This method of definition becomes regular usage with words designating parts of the body, but with this difference that the defining word is here the person's name, the name of the object, the dative reflexive *ser* or the dative of the personal pronoun (with or without the preposition *a*), the phrasal form or course being the later in point of time. Examples: *konongr lovar queðet oc tæk af hofði ser hatt æinum girðzkan buinn gulli*, etc., 60; *hon sætr Olafr son sinn i kne ser oc spurði*, 6; *oc var Þostæinn þegar fældr a fætr konongenom*, 93; *þu segir þat sem þer byr i brioste*, 89; *oc tok i hærðar hanum*, 52; *síðan stæig hann a bak heste æinshværium*, 73; *konongrenn stak æxarhyrnunni a kinn Ærlingi*, 70; *aðrum manne bætte hann þæim er Vindir hafðu tækit oc tungu or hofði skoret*, 114; \* \* \* *er skera let tungu or hofði manne þæim er Kolbæinn het*, 119.

21. It will be observed that in some of these cases the dative defines possessive relation, is functionally possessive, and may be replaced by the possessive pronoun. In the following sentence we have the dative and the possessive employed side by side in the same degree of possessive function: *þvi næst stræuk hann hændi sinni um augu hanum oc um læggi oc um alla limi hans þa sem sarer varo*, 109; also cf.: *Þa toko þeir prestenn ovaranda oc brutu baða fatlæggina a hanum oc skaro af tungu hans, oc ut stungu þeir augu hans bæðe*, 109. And

yet, semasiologically the kind of possessive which in the above examples is expressed by the dative or the phrase is a different one from the one which is designated by the possessive pronoun or the genitive case. As there are degrees of definiteness, so we must recognize kinds and degrees of possessive relation; thus, in *hon sætr Olaf son sinn i kne ser*, *sinn* is a possessive of origin or descent, while *ser* denotes a partitive possession. Neither are pure possessives. In the last passage quoted, the phrasal *a hanum* is used with *fotlæggina*, while the possessive pronoun *hans* is used later with *skaru ut* and *stungu*, the reason for the change to the possessive in these two cases being that the severing of the tongue and the eyes from the body proper makes impossible the use of the phrase *a hanum* or *i hanum*, which always expresses the idea of being attached to, i. e., physically a part of the person or object named. For the purpose of this investigation it is not necessary to enter more fully into the various degrees of possessive relation contained in these constructions.

The next step from the pronominal phrase or pronoun with possessive function, is to the definite form of the noun and first where the object named is severed from the body, as: *hæggr af hænne hondena*,<sup>31</sup> 56; *en siðan þa hogg af hanum havuðet*, 3; *hæggr af hanum fotenn*, 113; further, *yðr man skiota skiælk i briostet*, 35; *gott er þessom karle um hiartat*, 97; *en honnden a þeim hælga manne mate æigi brænna*, 110; *Kimbi retter til hondena*, 96.<sup>32</sup> In the last example the construction has arrived at the briefest form commensurate with perfect clearness, a construction which is today characteristic of all the Scandinavian languages and of German,<sup>33</sup> while English retains the construction with the often less clear<sup>34</sup> possessive pronoun. The definite

<sup>31</sup> But indefinite in: *sumir mann sægia at hann hægge haund af hænne ag skyti hana siðin*, 14.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. also *fotlæggina a hanum* above.

<sup>33</sup> Including even names of wearing apparel as well as parts of the body.

<sup>34</sup> Less clear in so far as here the post-positive article in Norse is ordinarily reflexive, thus defining the antecedent, or if it be not absolutely clear Norse adds the reflexive pronoun *sin* and there can be no ambiguity.

article came, further, to be used of the whole as well as the part as in the two sentences: *hestrenn læypr i iarðfall ætt undir hanum oc brotna fætrner aller a hestenom*, 84; *nu vænta ek at ek skilize ægi við konongenn, oc braut af skaftet af orenne oc sættiz niðr*, 95.

22. In idiomatic combinations of verb and noun, we finally have an indivisible group in which the noun is formally indefinite, though particularization may exist. Examples from our text are such expressions as: *hava sigr, fa sigr, sættia grið, gefa grið, raða land, sækia land, taka riki eftir, telja tru, taka tru, taka skirn, boða kristin dom, boða kristni, væita ansvor, væita lið, meta kaup, stefna þing, taka rað*, or with prepositions: *taka við kristni, fara i rækiu, blasa til moz, raðazk i færð* (or *til færðar*), *skiota a þingum, leggja við land, læypa i kaf, læggja ar a stræng, taka til konongs*.<sup>35</sup> The tendency from a group of words to form units of this sort expressive of a single idea becomes of course a very fruitful source for the growth of idioms and combinations which may run counter to logic and the grammar of the language. All that falls within the scope of this article, however, is to note their presence in Old Norwegian as a factor bearing upon the scope of the post-positive article. It is not always possible of course to ascertain whether a case is an actual (verbal or phrasal) formula and sometimes it cannot with absolute certainty be said whether or not a given case is actually intended to be definite; but usually the definiteness of the noun concept is clear and a very large number of these combinations have their lineal descendants in the modern dialects and find their parallels everywhere in Scandinavian speech.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Under the influence of the principle of expressing in definite form that which is present in the situation the nouns in these cases also are beginning to assume definite form, e. g.: *Biorn ræzk i ferðena*, 42.

<sup>36</sup> It is of course in the phraseology and formal word groups that the modern languages exhibit some of their most striking and fundamental differences.



## B. THE SCOPE OF THE POST-POSITIVE ARTICLE.

23. In the beginning of our discussion we defined the psychological basis of the post-positive article; we found the article to be the external inflexional symbol by which something is designated as familiar, already present in the situation and in the consciousness of the speaker. This result may have been brought about in various ways. The person or object may have been mentioned before, in the same word, in a synonym, in a compound, in a proper name, in a verb or in a group of words. We thereafter outlined the limitations in this general principle and found that certain formal factors, themselves having a definite idea-basis, operated to prevent the appearance of the definite article in a large number of cases where the individualization that it represented was nevertheless present. In some cases it was found that that individualization was expressed in other ways, as by a pronoun or an adverb; in still other cases that definiteness was already embodied in the nature of the word itself. In some cases there was evidenced a living growing principle according to which the language strives to express the definiteness which exists in the corresponding symbol of definiteness.

24. Among the classes of words discussed above as appearing in the indefinite form were certain terms for abstract ideas and names of unique objects (A, 8). We found there, however, that certain of these nouns regularly appear in the definite form, as *skapare*, *andskote* and *fiande*, 'the devil'. For examples see § 9 above. There was also noted a growing tendency to individualize the universe (*veroldrinn*, *hæimrinn*) or large parts of it (*haf*, *sky*, *tungl*). Some names of this general class have in our text already come to be regularly used in the definite form. These are: *tru*, 'the Christian faith', *log* 'the law', and *kristni*, 'christianity'. Examples: *aigi atlomk ec at taka truna*, 55; *biðr nu Valgerð taka truna*, 55; *i þann tíma Olafr Trygvason i land oc boðar þegar truna*, 87; *hann mindi nu bjoða kristnina*, 87; *firir því at kristnin var mjök af ser komenn*, 31; *þar er mestra umbota var apr avant um kristnina*,

37; *oc bauð þeim kristnina*, 34; *hann vil her allan sin matt imote læggia at firirkveða kristnina*, 54; *þa bæðizk hann nu at taka truna*, 55; *æigi mantu herra vilia briota logen*, 50.<sup>37</sup> However the indefinite is still used in: *þeir sem kristnir varo aðr hurvu after til kristni*, 38; *þeir skilldi alldrigin oftar ganga af kristni*, ; *siðan for Olafr konongr a Hæðmork oc snere þar margum mannum til truar*, 39.

25. Common nouns which approach the function of proper names as 'king, queen, earl, bishop,' vary between the definite and the indefinite form, but with a considerable preponderance of the definite. The occurrences without the article are: *en er Knutr konongr spurði þat er biscop hafðe mællt við Olaf*, 11; *nu talar Knutr konongr við ærkibiscop*, 11; *biscop svarar*, 11; *konongr værðer nu ræðr*, 11; *konongr sat i þjallðeno oc tælgði spiotskapt*, 20; *hvat er þat, kvað iarl*, 22; *Knutr konongr tækr við hanum forkunlega væl oc sætti hann iarl innan hirðar med ser*, 22; *siðan for konongr*<sup>38</sup> *ivir oc kom niðr a Sil*, 34; *þa spurði biscop hui hann var sva okatr*, 81; . . . . *sagðe ærkibiscupi oc korsbræðrom*<sup>39</sup> *fra andværðu hvesso faret hafðe med þeim*, 111; *hvat er þat kvað iarl*, 22.<sup>40</sup>

Examples of the definite form are: *þa com margygren upp oc græip þegar æitt skipet oc firir for þeirri skipsocn allre firir konongenom*, 14; *oc er buin var væizlan þa særker hann till væizlunnar, oc er drotningen en bliðazta við hann*, 1; *þicki konongenom hann gott*, 42; *en drotningen hværfr i brott ræð mioc*, 1; *þa kæmr at konongrenn svarar ængu*, 18; *læypr at konongenom, konongrenn brægðr sværði*, 18; *konongrenn lo oc mællte*, 20;<sup>41</sup> *oc sigldi iarlenn snækciunni milli knarrana*

<sup>37</sup> Log 'custom', and *sið*, 'manners, usage' also appear with the definite form, as: *æigi er þat loget at þer langfæðr eroð friðare en aðrer men*, 22; *hvesso mikit er skil þann siðenn er hann hævir eða konongr*, 55.

<sup>38</sup> Further *konongr* in 1, 3, 4, 20, 22, 34 (twice), 35, 80, 36, 59.

<sup>39</sup> This can be otherwise explained. See A, 16.

<sup>40</sup> There are a large number of other occurrences of the indefinite in words of this class, but other explanatory factors enter. See below.

<sup>41</sup> Other definite forms of *konongr* occur in: 43, 58.

*fram, \* \* \* rær nu iarlenn fram i sundet milli skipanna; Nu dasaðezc þar listuleg for iarlsens, 21; biscopenn svarar, 11 (but a few lines below biscop svarar); talar sændimaðrenn hve, etc., 76; prestrenn kvað við, 109.*

26. It is but a further extension of the principle observed above when these same nouns in plural are used without the article, the absence of the article being due here to the completeness of connotation, since each name includes all of the class or all that could be included in the given situation, as e. g., the opposing kings or parties in a battle, the legates in a particular mission, etc. Examples: *siðan foro sændimenn aftr oc sagðe Olave orð jarlsens, 26; þa for konongr a fund við bændr oc atte þing við þa, 35; bænndr hava iiii mærki oc xx oc c manna liðs undir hværiu, 90; nu sia konongsmenn skip þat er atte Rutr a Viggiu, 85; Nu ganga saman fylkingarnar oc bæriazk þeir nu snarplega oc af mikilli ræysti, væita konongsmenn harða viðtaku, 92; þa mællto varðmenn er skipet for i sundet, 67; sændimenn fara hæim oc sægia kononge þau orð er mællt varo, 47; nu stirðnaðu rikismenn við konongenn, 48; nu kæmr Asbiorn þann sama æftan til væizlunnar er konongrenn var komenn, ræðzc hann svæit með stæikarum, 49; annan dag paska koma nu konongsmenn i hærbirgi þessa manna, 59.*

The definite article is, however, equally common. Examples: *vikingarner læggia nu i braut, 58; oc er natta tækr pa somna þeir konongarner, 5; oc lætr nu upp fæsta alla sændimennena Knutz konongs, 76; nu er locet þinginu oc vilia nu sændimennener vita sinn kost, 47; nu tokst a nyialæik bardagenn med þæim Dag oc boandonom, 94; geck med sinn mærki hvar þæirra fæðganna, nu ganga saman fylkingarnar oc bæriazk þeir nu snarplega oc af mikilli ræysti, 92; nu foro þeir konongarner, etc., 65; nu finnaz þeir konongarner a Skane, 66; hæfr sva þegar upp at aller ero at quadder hirðmennener, 61; sva man kraptr guðanna skylda oss, 55.<sup>42</sup>*

27. In this group of words then the condition varies much from that in classical Old Icelandic, where the indefinite form

<sup>42</sup> The further occurrences of the definite are in chapters:

is the usual one (Nygaard, *Norrön Syntax*, p. 36). Certain occurrences call for special notice, as: *sa var hertoge æinn a Irlande er Guðþormr het, \* \* \* kærr var hann oc virkr konong-enom i Dyflinne þeim er Mardagus het*. It would seem here, perhaps, that the qualifying phrase *i Dyflinne* is of itself sufficiently particularizing, hence that the psychological definiteness that is present is transferred to and finds expression in the preceding independent noun.<sup>43</sup> And yet I think another factor has been equally operative in such cases toward fixing the definite form which is everywhere the regular one in modern speech in just such context as our example.<sup>44</sup> It is not the locality, but the king, which is in the foreground of consciousness at the time, *i Dyflinne* being relatively less stressed. The particularization that is present relates to the king and therefore gets expressed in that word, the qualifying phrase *i Dyflinne* simply forming a part of the single concept.<sup>45</sup> In *Scipi því styrde konongrenn sialfr*, the intensive *sialfr* expresses emphatic particularization and this particularization is transferred to the noun with which it is associated as a formal group (cf. also *messodagenn sialvan*, 123).

28. It now becomes necessary to illustrate the second and more complex method by which a thing comes to be regarded as having been presented to one's consciousness and receives in the first mention the mark of that fact. Here the object or person is named for the first time, has not been mentioned or suggested before. To illustrate: *þa mællte Olafr við lð sitt; takeð aller þat til raðs sem þer seð mik gera, Siðan let hann drega segl i hun upp en veðret stoð ovan af Agnafir; En er seglen varo upp dregen a skipi Olafs, þa stæmnir hann a Agnafir a fylcing Olafs hins svenska, en vindrenn gecc æftir vilia*

<sup>43</sup> Cf. *Nordiska Studier*, p. 437, where a somewhat similar construction occurs.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Han var elsket og afholdt af kongen af Dublin, som hed Mardagus; he was loved and respected by the King of Dublin, whose name was Mardagus.

<sup>45</sup> The case is different with such a case as Mardagus was king of Dublin; here the stress is equal for king and Dublin.



*Olafs Harallz sonar*, 16. Here the preparations for the departure and the hoisting of the sails which has just been mentioned has further brought into the field of consciousness that requisite for a good journey, a favorable wind, a fact which is indicated then in the definite *vindrenn*. Further: *Oc er hann kom i land þa er þess við getet at maðr kom af lande ovan þar sem konongr la með skipum sinum. Konongr sat i tialldeno oc tælgði spiotskapt. Boandenn giængr at hanum oc hælsar hanum*, 20. The fact that the king is encamped on shore includes in the situation the king's tent as a part of the equipment. *Oc því næst sa þeir mikinn flock boanda fara til þing-sens oc baro imillum sin mikit scrimsl oc mannlican oc var þat allt gulli glæst oc silfri. Oc nu sia þeir bænndr er a þinginu varo firir hvar guð þeirra for oc þa liupu þeir upp aller oc lutu því scrimsli. Sidan var þat sætt a miðian þingvollen*, 37: *nu kæmr Asbiorn þann sama æftan til væizlunnar er konongrenn var komenn ræðz hann i svæit með stæikarum. Nu er menn komo i sito þa fretta menn æftir hvesso er fære með þeim Asbirni. Hann sægir saguna quad mannen væl við værða allt þar til er hann scripti seglonom, þa quad hann næsta gratraust i kværkunum. Oc i því kæmr hann Asbiorn i stovona*, 49; *hann tok kono hans oc for i æinu hælli oc sat þar, oc kveðr hann visu er haun sa ivir bygðena*, 62.

29. These cases will suffice to indicate the underlying attitude which prompts the designation of things or persons as present in the situation. The tent of the king is a part of the army's camp; the thing-stead is a part of the situation wherever there is a discussion of an assembly; the mention of a feast presupposes a house for the holding of the feast; the mention of a cave includes within the general situation the locality where the cave is located. That is, the mention of an object or locality introduces, as thereby already in the situation, every part of that object or smaller portion of that locality, and vice versa, the mention of a part includes similarly the whole. This includes mention of the person and parts of the body; the warrior and his equipment; the king, his army and every-

thing associated with him in the march or in battle, or his realm as a whole; any other object and its parts, as the house, the ship, the sword, etc. In § 21 above under the discussion of fixed phrases used with pronouns governed by a preposition we have already met with illustration of the operation of this principle; the result was a double particularization, as the semi-possessive phrasal *a hanum* and the individualizing article in *fotlæggina* in the sentence: *þa toko þeir prestenn ovaranda oc brutu baða fotlæggina a hanum*, or again in the following: *gott er þessom karle um hiartat*, 97, or still further in *fætrner aller a hestennom*, 84, and *skaftet af orenne*, 95.

The illustrative material may be classified as follows: 1) with words for parts of the body: *oc er menn ero komner i sæmn er Rane uti staddr oc ætr hugenom hvart hann skal a braut taka svæinenn*, 4; *oc i því kom skot undir hond hauum vinstri, krokor æin milli rivianna*, 95; *ec stændr a kniom oc liggia ut iðren*, 95; \* \* \* *oc bartu þa hatt havuðet*, 90; *sker or sægir hann eða spæm um tongenne oc kipp sva or sareno at æigi slae harundenne saman*, 97; *læggr bringuna a vandbol-kenn oc andaðezk þa*; 2), with words for parts of objects: *hann fær til oc gripr um sværzhiolltena; hann briggðr sværðinu oc lysir halega*, 7; *Olafr sprættir upp oc bræggðr sværðinu oc trilhændir* \* \* \* *retter at hanum bloðræfilenn*, 7; *nu lætr Olafr drega upp strængina undir kiolenn snakciunnar oc vundu með vindasom*, 21; *nu var iarlenn upp læiddr a konongs skip... sættizt niðr i firrrumet*, 22; *Skialgr kom a Jaðar um nott, oc lyster a loftet þar er Ærlingr svaf*, 51; 3), with names for parts of equipment: *sprætt af hanum bælltinu oc knifinum*, 3; *oc skaut hann igiægnum bæði skiolldenn oc mannenn*, 27; 4) names for the army or officers: *siglir sunnan af Jotlande ivir Limafjorð með xii c skipa oc com at Agðum með allum hærenom*, 69; *oc mællto mennener at biða skilldi konongsens*, 14; *drekenn brunar fram vano braðare. Stambuinn bræggðr sværði oc hæggr til Þormoz*, 58; 5) words for the land or parts of locality: *Sigríð oc Enundi sunr hænnar hafðu suman lutan lannzens*, 5; *þa mællte Hiallte*: \* \* \* *guð hævir gefit yðr rikit oc*

*sva mikit valld*, 43; *i for varo með Svæini hinir mesto hofðingiar i landeno*, 26.

30. We now come to a group of constructions in which the noun which appears in the definite form because the idea is present in the context is already modified by an indefinite pronoun or a numeral, which results again in a double particularization somewhat similar to the one discussed in § 29 above. We shall first take the two pronouns *allr* and *hverr*. *Allr*, as specifying that all the objects named are included, partakes of the nature of an intensive qualifier; the definite form, *skipin*, for example, itself includes all the ships present in the situation, the added modifier merely emphasizing the completeness of the connotation. Now in so far as *allr* is perfectly definite (as including all of the objects mentioned) the post-positive article should be superfluous and was of course originally not used. Of this there are still illustrations, not only in general statements of objects taken in their entirety, but in names of particular objects present in the situation and which are taken in their entirety; thus: *um allar strander a landet*, 15; and e. g. *allt lið hans*. But in most such cases<sup>46</sup> the noun is further defined by another modifier as possessive or a phrase which therefore excludes the post-positive article by a principle discussed in § 12 above.<sup>47</sup> In all other cases where the thing or persons named are assumed to be present in consciousness, that is indicated in the particularizing article irrespective of the presence of a preceding pronominal qualifier. Examples: *allt hjartat*, 24; *alt feet*, 3; *með allum hærenom*, 52; *allt liðet*, 8; *alla sændimennina konongs*, 60; *rikit alt*, 52; *alt kornet*, 36; *rikit Viken*, 1; or with expressions of time: *alt sumaret*, 52; *allan dagen*, 81; *um alla nottena*, 37:

31. While *allr* emphasizes the completeness of the connotation collectively, *hverr* does the same thing distributively; in

<sup>46</sup> Cf. however *alra manna armaztr*, 70; but again *til allra hinna vitraztu manna oc storhofðingia i landeno*, 68.

<sup>47</sup> But *koma i oll hærröð með* etc., 68, or *aller bænnr*, 38, which, however, are governed by another principle.

the former case the mind takes in the objects as a whole, in the latter each separately as parts of the whole. Here two of the objects are present in the situation the noun appears in the definite form and there takes place again a dual particularization, one by the pronoun for the number taken, the other by the inflexional article designating the objects as present to consciousness. Examples: *hann læggr sinum megin sunzens hvarn knorrenn*, 21; *mærkia skal nu drotens svikarann hværn at nokcoro*, 70.

32. With *engi*, designating the rejection of the objects in their entirety (not distributively as English 'none of') the construction is of course the same (*engir mennener* (none), *mennener* designating all the men named before or present).

33. We now come to the pronouns *baðir*, *sum*, *far* and *halfr*, pronouns which seem to the modern point of view clearly partitive. It is, however, well at once to get away from our modern view-point in this case, for there is no reason whatever for assuming that the partitive idea was at all present in the consciousness of the speakers of the time in such constructions. The consideration that the old pronoun was ~~a~~ adjectival and that inflexionally there is agreement in number as between the pronominal adjective and the noun in all these constructions shows clearly that the partitive idea was not present in the linguistic consciousness from which the construction sprang. The same construction appears with numerals also. Thus we have *engir mennener*, not *engi mennena*, *alt liðet* not *alt liðsens*; and with numerals *æitt skipit* not *æitt skipena*, etc.<sup>48</sup>

The following passage offers several most interesting illustrations: *Olafr hafðe þar skip oc var þar nokcora rið \* \* \* oc er Olafr hafðe þar dvalsc sva langi sem hanum syndizc þa vændir haun a braut þapen, oc er hann for or aanne ut þa foro sum skipen firir arosanna ut: Ða com margygren upp oc græip*

<sup>48</sup> The partitive idea is however, present in such cases as the following: *en æigi er mæira aftr komet af liði því en ii hundrað manna*, 34; *Sigrið oc Emund sunr hannar hafði suman luta lannzens*, 5; *Sinum megin sunzens*, 21; *hælmíng lánz*, 9; *mart manna*, 9; *nokcot af slatre*, 73; *margir kœnnimenn af liði Olafs*.



þegar æitt skipet oc firir for þæirri skip soen allre firir konongenom. En annur skipen namo staðar við, oc mællte mennener<sup>49</sup> at biða skilldi konongsens. En er Oalfr kom þar oc sa hvat i hafðe gorzt þa hellt hann fyst sinn skipi i osenn ut. En þegar er hans skip kom i osenn þa kænir margygren þegar upp oc for ginande at skipi Olafs. Ða scaut Olafr spiote imote haune oc misti æigi oc laust hana sva at su hin illa vetr spracc þar. Oc var þat giæva Olafs þat sinn um þat fram sein aðrer foro; oc sumir menn<sup>50</sup> sægia at hann hægge haund of hænne oc skyti hana siðan, 14. Further examples: en langskipet gecc miklu mest fra aðrum skipunum, 69;<sup>51</sup> oc haun var tækin oc leiddr firir konongenn fyrr miklu en anuur skipen kæme aftir hanum, 69; Siðan var þat satt a miðian þingvollen, 37; ger sva væl hærri at tak þat rað er bazt hæver oc sæmelegast er, oc yðare tign byriar oc yðr er mest frame at oc vænst er, oc bazt giægni hvarotvæggia rikinn, 43; oc er skipet æit fær æftir hambre nokcorom fram þa etc., 53; ec var sættr af faedr minum oc af hinum rikazta kononge Knuti moðorbroadr minum ivir ii luti Nore, 22; ber hann nu feet (a girdle and a ring) til stangar oc vil nu iarlenn hava ii lutina, 4; Gizor slær undan aðrum fotenn, 90.

34. In the above we have dealt with the names of objects and place. But just as certain objects or the different places of a locality may be associated with one another in consciousness so the narrative of a succession of events necessarily includes the conception of the time of the action and the successive events. When a particular point in time is specified therefore, that, as being within the larger portion of time included in the events narrated, is already particularized and the word designating the time is put in the definite form. Examples: oc om kvælldet er menn ero bunir til drykciu ser Olafr at etc., 7; Oalfr gerðe sem hann mællte oc kom fyrr um morgonenn en

<sup>49</sup> 'the men present'.

<sup>50</sup> 'some men say, it is the saying of some men' (not those present, =mennener).

<sup>51</sup> Cf. giængr nu langskipet miket oc ifra adrum skipum Ærlings, 69:

*menn väre a vegom*, 19; (*konongr*) *var þar um nottenna oc frago at lið var mikit firir þeim*, 34; *en um nottena æftir þa dræymdi Guðbrand at etc.*, 34; *hann var með Ægli um vätrenn, foro utan um sumarit; a eno xiii are rikis Olafs konongs umhaustel kom Ðorer hund nordan af Finmork til Noregs*, 69; *um vätrenn æftir for Olafr konongr i Vik æystr oc var þar andværðan vätrenn*, 69; *hann hellt skytning alla xii manaðe oc væitti sinum mannum, nema þa æina stund er þær hafðuzc við i flocce um sumbrum nokcora stund* (every summer for a while), 48;

35. Gradually the tendency toward definiteness in temporal phrases develops to include other kinds of expressions of time, e. g.: *Olafr konongr let vel ivir þeirra boðe oc viðvare oc var þar annan vatr med þeim i goðo ivirlæte oc mikilli virðing sein vært var. En er a læið a stundena þa sagðe Olafr þeim at hann mindi hæim værða fara til Noreks*, 78. The adverbial *long stunden* of which we have one example in our text calls for a special remark. The occurrence is in Ch. 50: *Ðo at Asbiorn have halldet illa paskuhælgina, þa mantu þar igiægn vilia gera, oc er hanum þa æigi long stunden til given at bata. Konongr sægir: Mikta læggr þu a við hann; tak þu hann nu i þitt valld þar til er drettens dags hællgr er liðin oc dylsc æigi*, etc. We should here expect *long stund*, as it apparently expresses the indefinite idea of 'a long while;' the adjective moreover is strong in form. Yet the presence of the negative adverb *æigi* modifies also the idea of *long stund*, in that the idea of limited time is introduced, that is a partial individualization. Were it an affirmative sentence we should have to say (*ein*) *long stund*. The degree of individualization which is introduced by the negative *æigi* enables the expression-unit *long stund* to attach to itself the article, which results in the hybrid *long stunden*; this, then, became the fixed form whenever a negative was used with it, and survives in the language today (*lang stunden*, *lang stundi*, def. dial. form).

In the course of time definite expressions of time, as the days of the week, come to be used regularly with the definite article,

barring those formal phrasal combinations which we have discussed in §§20-21 above. For examples, see § 12. Further with indefinite pronoun: *flestan allan dogenn allt til þess er*, etc., 111; *nu öðrum dæginum*,<sup>52</sup> *þa fecc hann dur nokcon oc somnaðe hann*, 109; *nu samna þeir liði þvattdogenn oc um alla nottena*, 51; *nu fær Olafr konongr frett sanna at Knutr enn riki hævir allt sumarit samnat saman.....miklum hærr*, 69.

36. Finally we have the same principle underlying the use of the pleonastic personal pronoun before proper names or common nouns standing for persons already named in the context.<sup>53</sup> Examples: *nu foro þeir konongarner Olafr oc Anundr austr giægunum Aeyrarsund*, 65; *En þau atto dottor Olafr konongr oc Astrið*, 46; *siðan foro sændiboð millum þeirra Garðakonongs oc Syiakonongs*, 45; *Olafr konongr sækir stæmnuna oc hittazc þeir nu namnaner. Röða nu sin amilli*, 45; *þat blotaðu þeir lanz mennener oc þotte þeim þat landvorn mikil*, 14; *eitt sinni er þeir ræddozc við magarner Olafr oc Sigurðr*, 29; *drotningen lykr upp kistu sina, en svæinnenn Olafr var hia staddr*. The last two cases bring us to the appositional construction of an appellative followed by the proper name, as in names of cities, rivers, geographical divisions and titles which last in Old Norse (as elsewhere in Old Gmc.) generally are put after the proper name. Examples: *(koma) anne Tæms*, 10; *ut a ana Taems*, 10; *um vatnet Mjors*, 29; *ivir rikit Vikena alla*, 2; *Olafr konongr let miok æfla Kaupstaðenn i Niðarose*, 47; *Sigurð ullstrængur var sunn hans, er staðenn sætte i Niðarose*, 85; *Kaupstaðenn i Þronðhæimi*, 59.

The superlative with the definite noun occurs in: *ec sa stiga standa til himna oc himna upp lukazt oc var ek komenn a æpsta stiget*<sup>54</sup> *er þu vakter mec*, 89; *þat er soct at þa er gnyrenn var mestr at konongrenn læit æigi utar*, etc., 52.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

*The University of Illinois*, March 31, 1910.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. *oc varo þar aðra nött* (a second night). *En konongrenn la a bænom sinom um alla nottena* (during the whole night), 73.

<sup>53</sup> or before *aller* as: *oc þar komo þeir aller*, 33.

<sup>54</sup> But noun in indefinite form with adjective inflected weak however *a næsta dægi þegar*, etc., 116 (=modern *næste dagen*).



## THE STORIE OF ASNETH.

AN UNKNOWN MIDDLE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF A LOST  
LATIN VERSION.

The Storie of Asneth is one of the many Jewish embroideries upon the concise narrative of Holy Writ. It treats of the life and vision of Asenath, daughter of Potiphar, priest of Heliopolis, who was a maiden pure and proud, despising all men, till she fell under the magic spell of the personality of the great Joseph, "God's strong man." Asenath loved him, the story tells us, at first sight, and grieved so much at his refusal to kiss an idol worshipper that she discarded the gods of Egypt, fasted seven days in sack-cloth and ashes, and at last in a vision was told by an angelic visitor that her sore penance was accepted, and Joseph granted to be her lord. In proof of the truth of the message was performed upon her hand the pretty miracle of the bees of paradise. Her marriage to Joseph followed; and when Pharaoh's son sought to carry her off with the aid of Gad and Dan, Joseph's more truly born brothers, Benjamin, Simeon, and Levi, saved her from danger.

The narrative is an attractive one, as mediaeval legends go, and we can commend that fair and well-born lady's taste who desired her chaplain, or some person of the kind, to translate the Latin of the Story into English. Though he was "dull with dotage," "lame and unlusty," he "meeked him to his mistress," and taking the story, not from its Greek original, but as he found it in a Latin version from which Vincent of Beauvais had abridged it long before for his *Speculum Historiale*, (VI, cxviii—cxxiv), he produced a curious hybrid of poetry, having the sing-a-song-of-sixpence lilt of *Gamelyn*, and the stanzic form of Chaucer's *Troilus*.

This worthy cleric lived, I suppose, not far from Warwickshire, and not long after the death of Chaucer. He was fam-